

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS,
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/489,929	01/24/2000	Richard A. Lodge	9-13528-77US	6470		
20988	7590 05/22/2002					
OGILVY RE			EXAM	EXAMINER		
<b>SUITE 1600</b>	COLLEGE AVENUE		TRAN, P.	TRAN, PABLO N		
MONTREAL, CANADA	QC H3A2Y3		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	·		2684			
			DATE MAILED: 05/22/2002	DATE MAILED: 05/22/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			A
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Comments	09/489,929	LODGE ET AL.	V
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Pablo N Tran	2684	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence addr	ess
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC tute, cause the application to become a	a reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this commandament (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	5 March 2002 .		
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims			merits is
4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application	ion		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) <u>1-18,21-38 and 41-52</u> is/are rejected	ed.		
7) Claim(s) <u>19-20,39-40,53-54</u> is/are objected			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and			
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	cepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abe	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)□ approved b)□	disapproved by the Examiner.	
If approved, corrected drawings are required in	• •		
12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority docume</li> </ol>	ents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in	Application No	
Copies of the certified copies of the praphication from the International I * See the attached detailed Office action for a limit	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))		age
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	estic priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(e) (to a provisional a	pplication).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language p 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	provisional application has	been received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s	5) Notice of	v Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). f Informal Patent Application (PTO-1	
			·

Application/Control Number: 09/489,929

Art Unit: 2684

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 03/05/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the Applicant's arguments, Applicant's stated "Marturano et al. fail to disclosed the step of at least temporary interrupting data transmission over the poorly performing wireless link". Marturano et al. disclosed temporary interrupting data transmission over the poorly performing wireless link until the adequate data blocks is received (col. 4/ln. 8-49).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-2, 21-22, and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Marturano et al.* (5,636,230).

As per claims 1, 21, and 41, *Marturano et al.* disclosed a base station (fig. 1/no. 102-103, col. 2/ln. 49) being adapted for communications with one or more wireless terminals (fig. 1/no. 101, col. 2/ln. 47) over a wireless link wherein the base station

~ .46

Application/Control Number: 09/489,929

Art Unit: 2684

identify a poorly performing link and temporarily interrupting data transmission over the poorly performing wireless link (abstract, col. 2/ln. 58-col. 4/ln. 15).

As per claims 2, 22, and 42, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed monitoring one or more performance parameters related to each wireless link and comparing each monitoring performance parameters to a respective predetermined threshold (col. 3/ln. 9-19).

As per claims 3-4, 13, 23-24, 33, 43-44, and 49, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed the performance parameters related to each wireless link are based on interference on the wireless link and comprises any one or more of a S/N ratio, a user data throughput rate, a C/I ratio, a BER ratio, or a number of suspend frames (col. 3/ln. 65-col. 4/ln. 7).

As per claims 5, 25, and 45, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed an average, taken over a number of successive burst, of any one or more of the S/N ratio, the C/I ratio, the user data throughput rate, or the BER ratio (col. 4/ln. 26-33).

As per claims 6, 14, 26, 34, 46, and 50, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed suspending transmission of a data frame over the poorly performing wireless link (col. 2/ln. 58-col. 4/ln. 15, where it is clear that the block of data is dropped when it is determined that it has been inadequately received and a request to re-transmitted the block of data).

As per claims 7 and 27, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed resuming transmission of the data frame after a delay period (col. 4/ln. 8-15).

Application/Control Number: 09/489,929

Art Unit: 2684

As per claims 8, 16, 28, 36, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed the delay period is of random length (col. 4/ln. 16-40, where it is clear that the delay period is of random length due to the fact that until the portion of adequate data blocks has been received prior to the re-send counter has been reached).

As per claims 9, 17, 29, 37, 47, and 51, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed maintaining a count of dropped frames (col. 4/ln. 16-49, where it is clear that the counter keeps track of inadequate (dropped) received data blocks, see explanation in claim 6).

As per claims 10, 18, 30, 38, 48, and 52, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed suspending transmission if the count of suspended frames exceeds a predetermined threshold (col. 4/ln. 50-54).

As per claims 15 and 35, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed re-transmitting the dropped frame after a delay period (col. 4/ln. 40-49).

As per claim 11 and 31, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed restarting the transmission after a delay period (col. 4/ln. 63-col. 5/ln. 12).

As per claims 12 and 32, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed the delay is of random length (col. 4/ln. 63-col. 5/ln. 12).

# Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 19-20, 39-40, and 53-54 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Scholefield et al. (5,752,193), Dupont (5,729,542), Marin et al. (5,936,940), Kilkki et al. (6,011,778), Behtash et al. (5,745,480), Marsan et al. (6,131,049), and Kingdon et al. (6,078,818) disclose method for controlling QOS level parameters in a radiotelephone system.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pablo Tran whose telephone number is (703)308-7941. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Hunter, can be reached at (703)308-6732.

# Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

#### or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2684

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

May 18, 2002

PABLO N. TRAN
PATENT EXAMINER